



**HAL**  
open science

## Computing solutions of the paintshop necklace problem

Frédéric Meunier, Bertrand Neveu

► **To cite this version:**

Frédéric Meunier, Bertrand Neveu. Computing solutions of the paintshop necklace problem. 2011.  
hal-00601446v1

**HAL Id: hal-00601446**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00601446v1>**

Preprint submitted on 22 Jun 2011 (v1), last revised 20 Jul 2011 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# COMPUTING SOLUTIONS OF THE PAINTSHOP-NECKLACE PROBLEM

FRÉDÉRIC MEUNIER AND BERTRAND NEVEU

ABSTRACT. How to assign colors to occurrences of cars in a car factory ? How to divide fairly a necklace between thieves who have stolen it ? These two questions are addressed in two combinatorial problems that have attracted attention from a theoretical point of view these last years, the first one more by people from the combinatorial optimization community, the second more from the topological combinatorics and computer science point of view.

The first problem is the paint shop problem, defined by Epping, Hochstättler and Oertel in 2004. Given a sequence of cars where repetition can occur, and for each car a multiset of colors where the sum of the multiplicities is equal to the number of repetitions of the car in the sequence, decide the color to be applied for each occurrence of each car so that each color occurs with the multiplicity that has been assigned. The goal is to minimize the number of color changes in the sequence.

The second problem, highly related to the first one, takes its origin in a famous theorem found by Alon in 1987 stating that a necklace with  $t$  types of beads and  $qa_u$  occurrences of each type  $u$  ( $a_u$  is a positive integer) can always be fairly split between  $q$  thieves with at most  $t(q - 1)$  cuts. An intriguing aspect of this theorem lies in the fact that its classical proof is completely non-constructive. Designing an algorithm that computes these cuts is not an easy task, and remains mostly open.

The main purpose of the present paper is to make a step in a more operational direction for these two problems by discussing practical ways to compute solutions for instances of various sizes. Moreover, it starts with an exhaustive survey on the algorithmic aspects of them, and some new results are proved.

## INTRODUCTION

**The paintshop-necklace problem.** There is a beautiful combinatorial problem, which, depending on the point of view, appears as an hard optimisation problem or as one of the most beautiful applications of algebraic topology in combinatorics.

The optimisation version of the problem is called the *paint shop problem*, and was defined by Epping, Hochstättler and Oertel [10]. The origins of the model lie in car manufacturing with individual demands, which is reported to occur often in Europe. Given a sequence of cars where repetition can occur, and for each car a multiset of colors where the sum of the multiplicities is equal to the number of repetitions of the car in the sequence, decide the color to be applied for each occurrence of each car so that each color occurs with the multiplicity that has been assigned. The goal is to minimize the number of color changes in the sequence. If cars are considered to be letters in an alphabet, the following is a formalisation.

---

*Key words and phrases.* combinatorial optimization; integer programming; local search; paintshop problem; path-following method; splitting necklace; TFNP problem.

### Paint shop problem

INPUT: A finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  whose elements are called *letters*, a word  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \Sigma^*$ , a finite color set  $C$  and a requirement  $r : \Sigma \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ .

TASK: Find a *coloring*  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C^n$ , such that for all  $u \in \Sigma$  and  $c \in C$ , we have

$$|\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = c\}| = r(u, c),$$

and the number of color changes within  $\mathbf{c}$  is minimized.

We say that we have a *color change* in  $\mathbf{c}$  whenever  $c_i \neq c_{i+1}$ . The minimum of the number of color changes is denoted  $\gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{w}; r)$ .

The paint shop problem has a solution only if  $\sum_{c \in C} r(u, c)$  is exactly the number of occurrences of  $u$  in  $\mathbf{w}$ .

A special case has received a special attention: the *binary paint shop problem*, which is the case when  $|C| = 2$  and  $r(u, c) = 1$  for the two elements  $c$  in  $C$  and for all  $u \in \Sigma$ . In this case, we have  $n = 2|\Sigma|$ .

The other version of this problem is the *necklace splitting problem*, which found its motivation in a theorem of Alon [1] (for a didactic proof, see [12]).  $q$  thieves have stolen a precious necklace, which has  $n$  beads. These beads belong to a set  $\Sigma$  of  $t$  different types. Assume that the number of beads of each type is a multiple of  $q$ , say  $qa_u$  beads of type  $u \in \Sigma$ , where  $a_u$  is a positive integer. Remark that we have  $q \sum_{u \in \Sigma} a_u = n$ .

As we do not know the exact value of each type of beads, a fair division of the necklace consists in giving the same number of beads of each type to each thief. The number of beads of each type is a multiple of  $q$ , hence such a division is always possible: cut the chain at the  $n - 1$  possible positions. Isn't it possible to do the division with less cuts? The answer is yes, as shown by the following theorem proved by Alon:

**Theorem 1.** [1] *A fair division of the necklace with  $t$  types of beads between  $q$  thieves can be done with no more than  $(q - 1)t$  cuts.*

It was first proved by Goldberg and West in 1985 [11] when  $q = 2$  (this last theorem got a simpler proof in 1986, found by Alon and West and using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem [4]).

Note that this theorem tells nothing about the way of finding such cuts. Given a necklace satisfying the condition of the theorem, the necklace splitting problem requires to find the  $(q - 1)t$  (or less) cuts giving a fair division.

To make the parallel with the paint shop problem, the necklace can be seen as a word  $\mathbf{w}$  where the letters are the types of beads and the colors are the thieves. A formalisation is (only to respect the symmetry with the presentation of the paint shop problem)

### Necklace splitting problem

INPUT: A finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  of size  $t$  whose elements are called *letters*, a word  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \Sigma^*$  in which each letter  $u$  is present  $qa_u$  times where  $a_u$  is a non negative integer.

TASK: Find a coloring  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \{1, \dots, q\}^n$  such that for each  $u \in \Sigma$ , we have

$$|\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = 1\}| = \dots = |\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = q\}|,$$

and such that the number of color changes is less than or equal to  $(q - 1)t$ .

An instance of the necklace splitting problem is a special instance of the paint shop problem where each letter must occur a multiple of  $q$  times, where the set  $C$  of colors has cardinality  $q$  and

$r(u, 1) = \dots = r(u, q) = a_u$  for all  $u \in \Sigma$ .  $c_i$  indicates which thief (numbered  $1, \dots, q$ ) gets the  $i$ th bead. Theorem 1 states that in this case  $\gamma(\mathbf{w}, r) \leq (q - 1)t$ .

Finding solutions for the necklace splitting theorem, in addition to the motivation from a complexity point of view explained below, has applications for instance in VLSI circuit design [7, 16] or for hashing problems [3].

**Purpose of the paper and new results.** The purpose of this paper is to describe how to solve in practice the paint shop and the necklace splitting problems, by providing a survey of known algorithmic approaches and complexity properties, by giving new results and ideas and by testing some resolution methods through implementation and experiments. More precisely,

- we make a survey on the results and the methods to solve the paintshop-necklace problem. To our knowledge, it is the first survey on this topic. A special attention is paid to open questions.
- we describe a formulation of the paint shop problem as an integer linear program. Even if this formulation is quite natural, it was not given elsewhere. As we will see through experimentation, this formulation is quite useful to solve the paint shop problem and the necklace splitting problem for instances of small sizes. It can however deal with larger instances than the dynamic program of [10] for the paint shop problem and than the complete enumeration of [3] for the necklace splitting problem.
- to have alternative solutions for big instances, we propose simple meta-heuristics based on local search.
- for the necklace splitting problem with two thieves, we have implemented an exact algorithm described in [14] which is based on a pivoting argument similar to the one of simplex algorithm, or more clearly, to the one of Scarf's algorithm for computing fixed point [20], but where simplexes are replaced by cubes: it is a path-following method, with pivots, in a cubical complex.
- a special attention is also given to the binary paint shop problem for which we give new theoretical results.

**Plan.** The paper starts with a survey of known algorithmic approaches and complexity properties (Section 1). In the second section (Section 2), we describe the linear programming formulation, and discuss some variants. Section 3 deals with the binary paint shop problem. The computation of solutions for the necklace splitting problem through the pivoting scheme on cubical complexes is described in Section 4. For large instances, local searches can be tried (Section 5). Finally, all these approaches are evaluated and compared in Section 6.

## 1. WHAT IS KNOWN FROM THE ALGORITHMIC POINT OF VIEW

**1.1. The paint shop problem.** The paint shop problem is hard.

**Theorem 2.** [8, 15] *The paint shop problem is APX-hard, even if  $|C| = 2$  and  $r(u, c) = 1$  for all  $c \in C$  and  $u \in \Sigma$  (the binary case).*

**Theorem 3.** [10] *The paint shop problem is NP-hard even if  $|\Sigma| = 2$ .*

An exact algorithm is proposed by Epping, Hochstättler and Oertel in [10] using a dynamic programming approach. The algorithm runs in  $O(|C|n^{(|C|-1)|\Sigma|})$  where  $n$  is the length of  $\mathbf{w}$ , hence it seems unlikely to be applicable in practice.

**1.2. The binary paint shop problem.** For the binary case, which is APX-hard according to Theorem 2 a little more is known. In [8], the problem is translated into the matroid framework : the binary paint shop problem becomes the problem of finding a minimum size circuit containing a special element in a binary matroid. The authors note that finding the minimum number of changes for the binary paint shop problem is polynomial when the binary matroid satisfies the strong max-flow-min-cut property. In [15], it is explained how to find a minimum coloring itself in this case. Nevertheless, the strong max-flow-min-cut property for the binary matroid does not translate easily in terms of paint shop. In [15], some attempt is made in this direction and for instance, the following corollary is derived :

**Proposition 1.** [15] *The binary paint shop problem is polynomially solvable if the graph whose vertices are the letters and the edges are the pairs of crossing letters (that is, letters  $a, b$ , which occur in the order  $a, b, a, b$ ) is bipartite.*

In the same paper, the following theorem is proved, roughly through an equivalence with the min-uncut problem in 4-regular graphs, leading to “good solutions” for the binary paint shop problem.

**Theorem 4.** [15] *Let  $t = |\Sigma|$  be the size of the alphabet. A binary paint shop problem has a solution with at most  $1/4p + 3/4t$  color changes, where  $p$  is a lower bound of the optimal solution, and both  $p$  and the solution can be computed in polynomial time.*

It improves the easy bound  $\gamma \leq t$  which can be obtained with a simple greedy algorithm (it is also a consequence of Theorem 1 for  $q = 2$ ).

These “good solutions” are the best known today. Whether there is a constant factor approximation algorithm for the binary paint shop problem (asked implicitly in [10] and explicitly in [8]) is an open question.

**Open question.** Is there a constant factor polynomial approximation algorithm for the binary paint shop problem ?

Actually, the greedy algorithm can be quite efficient in some cases, as the following theorems proved in [5] show. The *greedy algorithm* for an instance of the binary paint shop problem consists in the coloring of the letters in the given order so as to change the current color only at the second occurrences of letters, and only if necessary. A word  $\mathbf{w}'$  is a *subword* of a word  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  if  $\mathbf{w}'$  is a subsequence of  $\mathbf{w}$  (two consecutive occurrences of a letter in  $\mathbf{w}'$  are not necessarily consecutive in  $\mathbf{w}$ ).

**Theorem 5.** [5] *The instances of the binary paint shop problem having neither a subword of the form  $xyxzzy$  nor a subword of the form  $xyyzxz$  are solved optimally by the greedy algorithm.*

Note that the two excluded subwords are the same up to a mirror symmetry.

**Theorem 6.** [5] *Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite alphabet of size  $t$ . When the instances of the binary paint shop problem are chosen uniformly at random among all instances of fixed size  $2t$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}(g) \leq \frac{2}{3}t,$$

where  $g$  is the number of color changes when one applies the greedy algorithm.

Actually, in [6], it is proved that actually we have (conjectured in [5])

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite alphabet and let  $t$  be its size. When the instances of the binary paint shop problem are chosen uniformly at random among all instances of fixed size  $2t$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$ , then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}(g) = \frac{1}{2}$$

where  $g$  is the number of color changes when one applies the greedy algorithm.

In the same paper, another greedy algorithm, the “recursive greedy algorithm”, is presented and it is proved that

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite alphabet and let  $t$  be its size. When the instances of the binary paint shop problem are chosen uniformly at random among all instances of fixed size  $2t$  with alphabet  $\Sigma$ , then*

$$\frac{2}{5}t + \frac{8}{15} \leq \mathbb{E}(rg) \leq \frac{2}{5}t + \frac{7}{10}$$

where  $rg$  is the number of color changes when one applies the recursive greedy algorithm.

Finally the following question is raised.

**Open question.** What is the expected value of the optimal solution of the binary paint shop problem ?

**1.3. The necklace splitting problem.** From a complexity point of view, the question of finding the number of cuts stated in Theorem 1 is an intriguing open question. Problems of similar nature are BROUWER, BORSUK-ULAM, SECOND HAMILTONIAN CIRCUIT, NASH, etc. (see [19] for their definitions). They are problems for which there is no chance to prove their NP-hardness, unless NP=co-NP [13], since the objects that have to be found always exist. Motivated by the question of computing a Nash equilibrium, Megiddo and Papadimitriou defined in [13] the complexity class TFNP, consisting exactly of all search problems in NP for which every instance is guaranteed to have a solution.

A subclass of the TFNP class is the PPAD class for which the existence is proved through the following argument :

*In any directed graph with one unbalanced node (node with outdegree different from its indegree), there must be another unbalanced node.*

This class was defined by Papadimitriou in 1994 [19] in a paper in which he also shows that there exists PPAD-complete problem, that is a problem in PPAD for which the existence of a polynomial algorithm would imply the existence of a polynomial algorithm for any problem in PPAD. The necklace splitting problem for  $q = 2$  belongs to the class PPAD, since it is a consequence of the Borsuk-Ulam theorem that belongs to PPAD<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, even if the search problem associated to the Borsuk-Ulam theorem is PPAD-complete, it is not known whether the necklace splitting problem for  $q = 2$  is PPAD-complete. This leads to the following question.

**Open question.** Is the necklace splitting problem for  $q = 2$  PPAD-complete ?

Or, a counterpart (asked for instance in [2])

**Open question.** Is the necklace splitting problem polynomial ?

---

<sup>1</sup>In [19], the necklace splitting problem is stated to belong to PPAD for any  $q$  but it seems unlikely to be true since in the general case, the necklace splitting theorem is a consequence of the more general Dold theorem, which is in PPA- $q$ .

Even in the case with two thieves ( $q = 2$ ), and even after some effort, one cannot guarantee a better running time than  $O(n^{t-2})$  for  $t \geq 3$ , and  $O(n)$  for  $t = 2$  [11]. It seems that we are in a similar situation as for the GRAPH ISOMORPHISM problem, which is an NP problem which is not known to belong to either the P class or the NP-complete class.

An algorithmic proof of the case with two thieves exists [14]. It is path-following method similar to the one used by Scarf [20] to prove Sperner's lemma. But, contrary to this latter proof, the path travels in a cubical complex, instead of a simplicial complex, and the labels are vertices of a cube, instead to be integers. Whether there is similar proof for more than two thieves remains open. This question is probably difficult since, although there are several proofs of this kind for the Borsuk-Ulam theorem, which hides behind the necklace splitting theorem for two thieves, there is no proof at all of this kind for the more general Dold theorem (see for instance the work by de Longueville and Zivaljevic [9]), which hides behind the necklace splitting theorem for an arbitrary number of thieves.

**Open question.** Is there a path-following proof of the necklace splitting theorem for an arbitrary number of thieves ?

## 2. LINEAR PROGRAMMING

2.1. **A first formulation.** Let's consider an instance  $(\mathbf{w}, r)$  of the paint shop problem with alphabet  $\Sigma$  and color set  $C$ . Assume  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  to be of length  $n$ . To ease the discussion, we introduce the notation  $P(u)$  which indicates for  $u \in \Sigma$  the positions of the letter  $u$  in  $\mathbf{w}$ .

Any solution  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$  can be encoded through variables  $x_{i,c}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $c \in C$  where

$$x_{i,c} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c_i = c \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

These variables must satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in P(u)} x_{i,c} = r(u, c) \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } u \in \Sigma$$

(the requirement is satisfied) and

$$\sum_{c \in C} x_{i,c} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

(each occurrence of a letter receives exactly one color).

Adding a variable  $y_i$  encoding whether there is color change between  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$ , we can formulate the binary paint shop problem as an integer linear program. Define for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_{i,c} \neq x_{i+1,c} \text{ for some } c \in C \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

The formulation is then

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \min \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in P(u)} x_{i,c} = r(u,c) \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } u \in \Sigma \quad (i) \\
& \sum_{c \in C} x_{i,c} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (ii) \\
& y_i \geq x_{i,c} - x_{i+1,c} \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad (iii) \\
& y_i \geq x_{i+1,c} - x_{i,c} \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad (iv) \\
& x_{i,c} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (v) \\
& y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \quad (vi)
\end{aligned}$$

To solve the necklace splitting problem, we can use this formulation in a branch-and-bound and stop as soon as a solution with at most  $(q-1)t$  color changes is found (as always in this paper  $q = |C|$  and  $t = |\Sigma|$ ). Moreover, we can use  $(q-1)t + 1$  as an upper bound in order to cut a subtree in the branch-and-bound tree even before having found a feasible solution (consequence of Theorem 1).

In the special case of the necklace splitting problem, we face a problem with high symmetries, similar of the ones of the coloring of graphs or for the bin-packing problem. The following solution is classical in such a situation.

**2.2. Killing symmetries.** Let us consider the necklace splitting problem. Any solution can be encoded (up to symmetry) through  $1 \leq j \leq i \leq n$

$$z_{j,i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c_j = c_i \text{ and } c_k \neq c_j \text{ for all } k < j \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

These variables must satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in P(u)} z_{j,i} = a_u z_{j,j} \quad \text{for all } u \in \Sigma \text{ and all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

(the requirement is satisfied) and

$$\sum_{j \leq i} z_{j,i} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

(each occurrence of a letter receives exactly one color).

An alternative formulation to (1) by an integer linear program for the necklace splitting problem is the following one.



$$\begin{aligned}
(2) \quad & \min \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in P(u)} z_{j,i} = a_u z_{j,j} \quad \text{for all } u \in \Sigma \text{ and all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\
& \quad \sum_{j \leq i} z_{j,i} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\
& \quad y_i \geq z_{j,i+1} - z_{j,i} \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\
& \quad y_i \geq z_{j,i} - z_{j,i+1} \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \\
& \quad z_{j,i} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for } \leq j \leq i \leq n \\
& \quad y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}.
\end{aligned}$$

$z_{j,i}$  is equal to 1 if  $u_i$  gets the same color as  $u_j$  and if  $u_j$  is the first occurrence of a letter getting this color. It is clear that any solution of the necklace splitting problem can be encoded in such a way. More interesting, this formulation has not the drawback of the formulation (1): two solutions identical up to a permutation of  $C$  lead to the same solution of (2).

**2.3. Another formulation when there are only two colors.** If there are only two colors, another formulation is possible, namely the following one, which uses less variables than the preceding ones.

Fix one of the color  $c \in C$ . The interpretation of the variables is now straightforward.

$$\begin{aligned}
(3) \quad & \min \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in P(u)} x_i = r(u, c) \quad \text{for all } u \in \Sigma \quad (i) \\
& \quad y_i \geq x_i - x_{i+1} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad (ii) \\
& \quad y_i \geq x_{i+1} - x_i \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \quad (iii) \\
& \quad x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (iv) \\
& \quad y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \quad (v)
\end{aligned}$$

**2.4. Lagrangian relaxation.** The first formulation (1) suits Lagrangian relaxation. We haven't implemented it. If we relax constraints (iii) and (iv), we get the following Lagrangian subproblem

$$\sum_{u \in \Sigma} l_u(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu}') + \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( 1 + \sum_{c \in C} (\mu_{i,c} + \mu'_{i,c}) \right) y_i,$$

where  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = ((\mu_{i,c}))_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, c \in C}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}' = ((\mu'_{i,c}))_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, c \in C}$  and  $l_u(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\mu}')$  is the value of

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \sum_{i \in P(u), c \in C} (\mu_{c,i-1} + \mu'_{c,i-1} - \mu_{c,i} - \mu'_{c,i}) x_{c,i} \\ \text{s.t.} & \left. \begin{array}{l} \sum_{i \in P(u)} x_{i,c} = r(u, c) \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } u \in \Sigma \\ \sum_{c \in C} x_{i,c} = 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in P(u) \\ x_{i,c} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } c \in C \text{ and } i \in P(u) \end{array} \right\} \end{array}$$

which is the value of an optimal  $\mathbf{b}$ -matching in a bipartite graph, computable in strongly polynomial time.

Since for any values of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}'$ , the Lagrangian subproblem has integer solutions, it has the so-called *integer property*, and the Lagrangian relaxation does not provide a better bound than the linear relaxation. Anyway, such a relaxation is interesting here since solving the Lagrangian multiplier problem is probably more efficient than solving the linear programming relaxation directly.

### 3. BINARY PAINT SHOP PROBLEM

In the Introduction, we have already explained what kind of approaches have been tried for the binary paint shop problem. In [8], a lower bound – computable in polynomial time through dynamic programming – has been proposed for this problem. The same bound has been used in [5] to prove Theorem 5. We will recall what this bound is. Then we give a new result, which is a necessary and sufficient condition for this bound to be optimal. We start also a discussion about the expected value of the optimal value of the binary paint shop problem. Finally, we sketch new approaches to solve the binary paint shop problem.

Define for each input  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_{2t})$  of the binary paint shop problem an hypergraph on the set  $\{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$  defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) := \{\{i, i + 1, \dots, j - 1\} : 1 \leq i < j \leq 2t, u_i = u_j\}.$$

The hyperedges are intervals. In terms of the paintshop problem one can think of the elements of  $\{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$  as possible moments for color change: if moment  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 2t - 1$ ) is chosen, that means changing the color right after the occurrence of  $u_i$  (before the occurrence of  $u_{i+1}$ ). The binary paint shop problem consists in *designing a minimum number of color changes so that each hyperedge – each interval – of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  contains an odd number of them*. Less formally, suppose given a finite set of intervals on the real line, the binary paint shop problem aims to find the minimum number of points such that each interval contains an odd number of them. Any finite set of intervals is not a  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ . Easily,

**Claim 1.** *All intervals in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  have distinct right endpoints. The same holds for left endpoints.*

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a set of subsets of a finite set  $V$ . Two subsets  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$  are said to be *crossing* if

$$A \not\subseteq B \quad \text{and} \quad B \not\subseteq A \quad \text{and} \quad A \cap B \neq \emptyset.$$

If there are no crossing subsets in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}$  is said to be *laminar*. The notion of laminar set is a very classical one in combinatorial optimization. In the case of binary paintshop problem, one will need a more specific notion. A set  $\mathcal{C}$  is *evenly laminar* if

- it is laminar, and

- for all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is an even number of subsets of  $\mathcal{C}$  contained in  $A$  and distinct from  $A$ : the set  $\{B \in \mathcal{C} : B \subsetneq A\}$  has an even cardinality.

The following proposition is proved in [8].

**Proposition 2.** [8] *Let  $\mathbf{w}$  be an input of the binary paint shop problem and let  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ . If  $\mathcal{B}$  is evenly laminar, then one has  $\gamma(\mathbf{w}) \geq |\mathcal{B}|$ . In other words, the cardinality of any evenly laminar subset of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is a lower bound for the binary paint shop problem.*

As already noted, the greedy algorithm allows us to find a solution of the binary paint shop problem with at most  $t$  changes. In general, the optimum  $\gamma(\mathbf{w})$  is smaller than  $t$ , but Proposition 2 shows that if the input  $\mathbf{w}$  is such that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar, then we cannot do better than  $t$ . In fact, the evenly laminar inputs are precisely the inputs for which we cannot do better than  $t$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\mathbf{w}$  be an input of the binary paint shop problem and let  $t = |\Sigma|$  be the size of the alphabet. Then  $\gamma(\mathbf{w}) = t$  if and only if  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar.*

In terms of the necklace splitting problem, this proposition characterizes completely the case when we cannot do better than the number of cuts given by the necklace splitting theorem (Theorem 1) for two thieves and for  $a_u = 1$  for all  $u \in \Sigma$ . For more than two thieves or for different values of the  $a_u$ , such a characterization is not known.

To prove Proposition 3, we will need the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{w}$  be an input of the binary paint shop problem such that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar. Let  $T \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$  be such that for each  $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ , the cardinality of  $T \cap I$  is odd. Then for each  $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  there is  $x_I \in I \cap T$  in  $T$  such that  $x_I \notin K$  whenever  $K \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  and  $K \subsetneq I$ .*

*Proof.* By induction, on the cardinality of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ . Delete an interval  $J$  of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  that is maximal for inclusion. Apply induction. We get an  $x_I$  for each interval  $I \neq J$  such that  $x_I \in I \cap T$  but  $x_I \notin K$  whenever  $K \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$  and  $K \subsetneq I$ . It is easy to see that, since  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar and since  $|T \cap I|$  is odd for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  such that  $I \subseteq J$ , there is an element of  $T$  which is contained in  $J$  but in no other interval of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Assume first that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar. A solution with at most  $|\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})|$  changes can be found through the greedy algorithm. Proposition 2 allows us to conclude that it is optimal.

For the other direction, assume now that  $\gamma(\mathbf{w}) = |\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})|$ . We will prove by induction on  $t$ , which is  $|\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})|$ , that in this case  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is evenly laminar. For  $t = 1$ , it is obvious.

Assume  $t \geq 2$ .

Let  $T$  be a subset of  $\{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$  such that each interval of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  contains an odd number of elements of  $T$  and suppose that  $T$  is minimum. In other words,  $T$  is an optimal solution.

Denote by  $J$  the interval that has  $2t - 1$  as right endpoint. Denote by  $k$  the new highest right endpoint of an interval in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$  (note that  $k = 2t - 2$  or  $k = 2t - 3$ ). By induction,  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$  is evenly laminar otherwise the greedy algorithm would extend an optimal solution on  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$  to an optimal solution for  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  that is smaller than  $T$ .

Suppose now for a contradiction that there exists an interval  $I$  in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  such that  $I$  and  $J$  are crossing. Take  $T'$  an optimal solution for  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$ . According to Lemma 1, there is an  $x \in T'$  such that  $x$  is in  $I$  but in no other interval  $K \subseteq I$ . Deleting  $x$  from  $T'$  and replacing it by one of the endpoints of  $I$  (depending on whether  $x \in J$  or not), we get a solution for  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  with only  $|T'| < |T|$  color changes. Contradiction.

Hence,  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$  is laminar, and necessarily every laminar otherwise any solution for  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) \setminus \{J\}$  would be a solution for  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w})$ .  $\square$

In [6], it is asked whether it is possible to find the expected value of the optimal value when the instances are drawn uniformly at random. According to Theorem 8, we have  $\mathbb{E}(\gamma) \leq \frac{2}{5}t + \frac{7}{10}$ . We were not able to propose an interesting lower bound on  $\mathbb{E}(\gamma)$ , but we conjecture that  $\mathbb{E}(\gamma) = o(t)$ . Anyway, with the help of the formulation of Subsection 2.1 and with the help of CPLEX (see Section 6 for more details) we have computed the average value  $\bar{\gamma}$  of  $\gamma$  for various values of  $|\Sigma|$ . Each value  $\bar{\gamma}$  in the following array results from the computation of the optimal solution of 10 instances of the binary paint shop problem uniformly taken at random among instances for fixed  $|\Sigma|$ .

$ \Sigma $	10	20	40	80	90	100	110	120
$\bar{\gamma}$	4.1	7.2	13	23.4	26.1	28.2	31.1	35.4

It might help one of our readers to formulate a conjecture.

**Remark.** When looking at the lower bound provided by Proposition 2, it is tempting to use it in a branch-and-bound scheme. Partial solutions are given naturally in this context by subsets  $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$  and by fixing an element in  $\{0, 1\}^S$ : if  $i \in S$  is fixed to 1, it means that  $i$  must be a color change (the color of  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  must be different), and if  $i$  is fixed to 0, then  $u_i$  and  $u_{i+1}$  must have the same color. We see that, to get lower bounds for partial solutions, we shall generalize the notion of evenly laminar set. Indeed, when a partial solution is already fixed, the binary paint shop problem becomes: *let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a set of intervals of  $\{1, \dots, 2t - 1\}$ ; let  $\alpha : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ; design a minimum number of color changes so that each interval  $I$  of  $\mathcal{I}$  contains a number  $= \alpha(I) \bmod 2$  of them.* We could call this problem *the generalized binary paint shop problem*.

So, the suitable generalization of evenly laminar is the  $\alpha$ -laminar set. A set  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\alpha$ -laminar, with  $\alpha : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , if

- it is laminar, and
- for all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , the set  $\{B \in \mathcal{C} : B \subsetneq A\}$  has a cardinality  $= \alpha(A) + 1 \bmod 2$ .

It is not too difficult to prove that the cardinality of  $\alpha$ -laminar subsets of an input of a generalized binary paint shop problem is a lower bound for this latter problem. To compute the largest  $\alpha$ -laminar subset, the dynamic programming approach described in [8] can be straightforwardly adapted. Having a way to encode partial solutions and to compute lower bounds can lead to a branch-and-bound scheme. We have implemented it but it is not at all competitive in comparison with the linear programming approach of the previous section. Nevertheless, this can be used to derive valid inequalities for programs (1) or (2) specialized for the binary paintshop of the type

$$\sum_{i \in \cup \mathcal{J}} y_i \geq |\mathcal{J}|$$

for some  $\alpha$ -laminar subsets  $\mathcal{J}$ . Violated inequalities of this type can be computed through a similar dynamic programming approach, but we have not tested this possibility of improvement.

#### 4. NECKLACE SPLITTING THROUGH CUBICAL COMPLEXES

We come now back to the necklace splitting problem, for which the only known algorithmic proof deals with the case with  $q = 2$  (two thieves) and is given in [14]. The problem is the following.

### Necklace splitting problem for two thieves

INPUT: A finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  of size  $t$  whose elements are called *letters*, a word  $\mathbf{w} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \Sigma^*$  in which each letter  $u$  is present an even number of times.

TASK: Find a coloring  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \{1, 2\}^n$  such that for each  $u \in \Sigma$ , we have

$$|\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = 1\}| = |\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = 2\}|,$$

and such that the number of color changes is less than or equal to  $t$ .

Recall that more poetically the letters are the types of beads, the word  $\mathbf{w}$  is the sequence of beads on the chain, and that the two colors correspond to the two thieves: for instance,  $c_i = 1$  indicates that the  $i$ th bead goes to the thief number 1.

**4.1. Cubical complexes.** Let  $C$  be a cube,  $\partial C$  the boundary of  $C$ , and  $V(C)$  the set of vertices of  $C$ . Two facets of a  $m$ -cube are said to be *adjacent* if their intersection is a  $(m-2)$ -cube. For a given facet  $\sigma$  of  $C$ , there is only one non-adjacent facet. Two non-adjacent facets are *opposite*.

A *cubical complex* is a collection  $\mathbf{K}$  of cubes embedded in an Euclidean space such that

- if  $\tau \in \mathbf{K}$  and if  $\sigma$  is a face of  $\tau$  then  $\sigma \in \mathbf{K}$  and
- if  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  are in  $\mathbf{K}$ , then  $\sigma \cap \sigma'$  is a face of both  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ .

A cubical complex is said to be *pure* if all maximal cubes with respect to inclusion have same dimension.

$V(\mathbf{K})$  is the set of vertices of the cubical complex  $\mathbf{K}$ .

A  *$m$ -dimensional cubical pseudo-manifold*  $\mathbf{K}$  is a pure  $m$ -dimensional cubical complex in which each  $(d-1)$ -dimensional cube is contained in at most two  $m$ -dimensional cubes. The *boundary* of  $\mathbf{K}$ , denoted by  $\partial \mathbf{K}$ , is the set of all  $(m-1)$ -cubes  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma$  belongs to exactly one  $m$ -dimensional cube of  $\mathbf{K}$ .

Let us denote by  $C^m$  the cubical complex which is the union of the cube  $\square^m := [-1, 1]^m$  and all its faces.

Let  $k \geq 0$  be an integer. Given  $k$  distinct integers  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$ , each of them in  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , and  $k$  numbers  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_k$ , each of them belonging to  $\{-1, +1\}$ , we denote

$$F \left( \begin{array}{cccc} i_1 & i_2 & \dots & i_k \\ \epsilon_1 & \epsilon_2 & \dots & \epsilon_k \end{array} \right) := \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \in \square^d : x_{i_j} = \epsilon_j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, k\},$$

which is a  $(m-k)$ -face of  $\square^m$ . For  $k=0$ , this face is  $\square^m$  itself.

Let  $\mathbf{K}$  and  $\mathbf{L}$  be cubical complexes, and let  $\lambda : V(\mathbf{K}) \rightarrow V(\mathbf{L})$  be a map.  $\lambda$  is called a *cubical map* if  $\lambda$  satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) for every  $\sigma \in \mathbf{K}$ , there is a  $\tau \in \mathbf{L}$  such that  $\lambda(V(\sigma)) \subseteq V(\tau)$
- (2)  $\lambda$  takes adjacent vertices to adjacent vertices or both to the same vertex.

By a slight abuse of notation, we write  $\lambda : \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}$ . We emphasize the fact that  $\lambda(V(\sigma))$  in the definition above is not necessarily the vertex set of a cube.

Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a cubical complex and let  $\lambda$  be a  $\mathbf{K} \rightarrow C^m$  cubical map. A  $d$ -cube of  $\mathbf{K}$  (with  $0 \leq d \leq m$ ) is said to be *full* if its image under  $\lambda$  is of the form

$$F \left( \begin{array}{cccc} d+1 & d+2 & \dots & m \\ \epsilon_1 & \epsilon_2 & \dots & \epsilon_{m-d} \end{array} \right).$$




FIGURE 1. An illustration of  $M$  for  $n = 2$  and  $t = 2$ .

**4.2. An algorithm finding a full  $t$ -cube.** Let  $M$  be the cubical pseudo-manifold without boundary obtained by subdividing  $\partial\mathcal{C}^{t+1}$  by means of the hyperplanes  $x_i = \frac{j}{n}$  where  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t+1\}$  and  $j \in \{-n+1, -n+2, \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-2, n-1\}$ .

We endow  $M$  with *hemispheres*. These hemispheres are denoted  $+H_0, -H_0, +H_1, -H_1, \dots, +H_t, -H_t$ .  $+H_i$  (resp.  $-H_i$ ) is the set of points  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{t+1})$  of  $\partial\mathcal{C}^{t+1}$  such that  $x_{i+1} \geq 0$  (resp.  $x_{i+1} \leq 0$ ), and such that, if  $i \leq t-1$ , then  $x_j = 0$  for  $j > i+1$ . The *sign* of the hemisphere  $+H_i$  (resp.  $-H_i$ ) is  $+$  (resp.  $-$ ).

On Figure 1, the hemispheres of  $\partial\mathcal{C}^3$  are highlighted.

The *carrier hemisphere* of a cube is the hemisphere of smallest possible dimension containing it. The *sign* of a cube is the sign of its carrier hemisphere. For  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, t\}$ ,  $H_i$  is homeomorphic to the ball  $B^i$ ,  $(+H_i) \cup (-H_i)$  is homeomorphic to the  $i$ -dimensional sphere  $S^i$ , if  $i \geq 1$ ,  $\partial(+H_i) = \partial(-H_i) = (+H_{i-1}) \cup (-H_{i-1})$  and  $H_t \cup -H_t = \partial\mathcal{C}^{t+1}$ .

Now, assume that we have a  $M \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^m$  cubical map  $\lambda$  for some  $m \geq t$  and assume moreover that  $\lambda$  is *antipodal*, that is that  $-\lambda(v) = \lambda(-v)$  for any vertex  $v \in V(M)$ .

In [14], the algorithm of Figure 2 is described. It is a path-following algorithm, similar to Scarf's algorithm computing fixed point for continuous mapping [20]. Since it is very far from the exhaustive enumeration of the  $t$ -cubes of  $M$ , we may hope that a similar phenomenon that for Scarf's algorithm happens, that is that it provides a fast algorithm to find full  $t$ -cubes. The experimentation is made in Section 6.

We have

**Theorem 9.** [14] *The algorithm described on Figure 2 finds a full  $t$ -cube.*

**4.3. Application to the necklace.** The necklace is identified with the interval  $]0, n[ \subset \mathbb{R}$ . The beads are numbered with the integers  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , from left to right. The  $k$ th bead occupies uniformly the interval  $]k-1, k[$ .

```

Algorithm (input an oracle giving the value of  $\lambda$  on each vertex of  $\partial M$ ).
initialize  $\sigma := (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in M$  (the 0-dimensional cube);
initialize  $\tau$  is the 1-dimensional cube in  $H_1$  or  $-H_1$  (the sign is determined by the sign of  $\sigma$ );
while  $\tau$  is not a full  $t$ -cube do
  if  $\tau$  is a full  $(d-1)$ -cube of  $\pm H_d$  for some  $d$ 
    set  $\sigma'$  to be the  $d$ -cube of  $\pm H_d$  distinct from  $\sigma$  containing  $\tau$ ;
  endif
  if  $\sigma$  is a full facet of  $\tau$ 
    set  $\sigma'$  to be the facet opposite to  $\sigma$ ;
  endif
  if  $\tau$  is a full  $d$ -cube of  $\pm H_d$  for some  $d$ 
    if  $\sigma$  is a facet of  $\tau$ 
      set  $\sigma'$  to be the  $(d+1)$ -cube having  $\tau$  as a facet
      and whose carrier hemisphere has the same sign than  $\tau$ ;
    endif
    if  $\tau$  is a facet of  $\sigma$ 
      set  $\sigma'$  to be the full facet of  $\tau$  whose sign is the sign of the carrier hemisphere of  $\tau$ ;
    endif
  endif
  set  $\sigma \leftarrow \tau$  and  $\tau \leftarrow \sigma'$ ;
endwhile
return  $\tau$ .

```

FIGURE 2. The algorithm finding a full  $t$ -cube .

For  $S \subseteq ]0, n[$ , we denote by  $\phi_i(S)$  the quantity of beads of type  $i$  in positions included in  $S$ . More precisely, we denote by  $\mathbf{1}_i(u)$  the mapping which indicates if there is a bead of type  $i$  at point  $u$  of  $]0, n[$ :

$$B_i(u) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if the } \lceil u \rceil \text{th bead is of type } i \text{ and if it is the first bead of this type.} \\ 1 & \text{if the } \lceil u \rceil \text{th bead is of type } i \text{ and if it is not the first bead of this type.} \\ 0 & \text{if the } \lceil u \rceil \text{th bead is not of type } i. \end{cases}$$

We have then

$$\phi_i(S) := \int_S B_i(u) du.$$

The definition of  $B_i$  may be surprising since the first bead of each type is counted twice; this is only a trick to avoid tie between the two thieves.

Let  $x := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{t+1})$  be a vertex of  $M$ . We order the  $x_i$  in the increasing order of their absolute value. When  $|x_i| = |x_{i'}|$ , we put  $x_i$  before  $x_{i'}$  if  $i < i'$ . This gives a permutation  $\pi$  such that

$$|x_{\pi(1)}| \leq |x_{\pi(2)}| \leq \dots \leq |x_{\pi(t+1)}| = 1.$$

Then, we define  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_t) : V(M) \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}^t$  as follows: we cut the necklace at points  $n|x_i|$  (among the  $|x_i|$ , at most  $t$  are different from 1). By convention,  $x_{\pi(0)} := 0$ ; we define:

$$\lambda_i(x) := \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \sum_{j=0}^t \text{sign}(x_{\epsilon(j)}) \phi_i(\lceil n|x_{\pi(j)}|, n|x_{\pi(j+1)}| \rceil) > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if not,} \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ , where  $\epsilon(j)$  is the smallest integer  $k$  such that  $|x_k| \geq |x_{\pi(j+1)}|$ , and with the convention  $\text{sign}(0) := 0$ .




FIGURE 3. The cuts associated to the vertex  $x_1 = \frac{6}{16}$ ,  $x_2 = -\frac{3}{16}$ ,  $x_3 = -1$ ,  $x_4 = -\frac{12}{16}$ .

This formula can be understood as follows:  $\lambda_i$  equals  $+1$  (resp.  $-1$ ) if the first thief gets strictly more (resp. strictly less) beads of type  $i$  than the second one, when we cut at points  $n|x_j|$  of the necklace, and the sign of  $x_k$  shows the thief who gets the  $(j + 1)$ th sub-necklace, where  $k$  is the smallest integer such that  $n|x_k|$  is greater than or equal to the coordinate of any point of the sub-necklace.

Let us give an example. Figure 3 shows a necklace with  $n = 16$ ,  $t = 3$ , and 4 cuts. These 4 cuts are compatible for instance with the vertex  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  where

$$x_1 = \frac{6}{16}, x_2 = -\frac{3}{16}, x_3 = -1, x_4 = -\frac{12}{16}.$$

There are 4 sub-necklaces: the first one goes to the thief  $+$  since the minimal index  $k$  such that  $16|x_k|$  is greater than all points of this sub-necklace is 1; the second one goes also to  $+$ ; the third and the fourth ones go to  $-$ . The image of this vertex through  $\lambda$  is  $(+1, -1, -1)$  where the first component corresponds to the blue beads (color 1), the second one to the red beads (color 2), and the third one to the green beads (color 3).

We have two important properties, proved in [14].

**Claim 2.**  $\lambda$  is a cubical map and it is antipodal.

**Claim 3.** Any full  $t$ -cube in  $M$  has a vertex that encodes a fair splitting.

Since such a full  $t$ -cube has necessarily a vertex encoding a fair splitting, according to Theorem 9 the algorithm of Figure 2 provides an algorithm solving the necklace splitting problem. Nevertheless, we have *a priori* no guarantee on the time needed to solve a real problem. In Section 6, this algorithm is experimented. In the next subsection, we say a little more on the way of encoding the cubical complex and of checking the sign or whether a cube is full or not.

#### 4.4. Algorithm and data structures.

4.4.1. *Cubes.* A cube  $\sigma$  of  $\partial M$  is encoded through a couple  $(\text{LowerPoint}, \text{UpperPoint})$  where **LowerPoint** (resp. **UpperPoint**) is the coordinate of the vertex having the lowest (resp. highest) values for each coordinate. Note that there are no ambiguity and that the dimension of  $\sigma$  is the number of coordinates that differ between **LowerPoint** and **UpperPoint**.

Compute one and for all the matrix **BeadsPerTypes** such that **BeadsPerTypes**  $(i, j)$  is the number of beads of type  $j$  at a position in  $\{1, \dots, i\}$ .

4.4.2. *Advantage per type.* The discussion above makes clear that the following routine is central: given a vertex (a selection of cuts) described as a  $t + 1$ -uple  $(x_1, \dots, x_{t+1})$  of elements in  $\{-1, \dots, -2/n, -1/n, 0, 1/n, 2/n, \dots, 1\}$  and a subset  $S \in \Sigma$  of beads, give for each type in  $S$  which thief is advantaged. It can be done in  $O(t|S|)$  as follows.



First, define the sequence  $x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_{t'}$  (with  $t' \leq t$ ) which keeps from  $(x_1, \dots, x_{t+1})$  only the cuts that play a role. A cut plays a role if the sub-necklaces it separates go to different thieves. To perform this task, we delete all cuts  $x_i$  such that  $|x_j| > |x_i|$  for some  $i > j$ . It can obviously be done in  $O(t)$ .

Second, for each type  $j \in S$ , the difference of what get the two thieves is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t'} (-1)^{\text{sign}(x'_i)} \text{BeadsPerTypes}(i, j).$$

4.4.3. *Sign.* The sign of a  $d$ -cube is given by the thief advantaged for type  $d$ .

4.4.4. *Carrier hemisphere.* The carrier hemisphere of a vertex is given by the rank and the sign of its last nonzero coordinate.

## 5. LOCAL SEARCHES

We have developed two local search models, one for the paintshop problem, and one for the necklace splitting.

5.1. **Paintshop moves.** For the general paint shop problem, the objective to minimize is the number of color changes. The initial configuration is an admissible coloring  $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C^n$  such that it satisfies the coloring constraints, i.e.

$$|\{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : u_i = u \text{ and } c_i = c\}| = r(u, c) \quad \text{for all } u \text{ and } c.$$

The local search algorithm performs swap moves in the sequence between two positions  $i_1 < i_2$  such that

- $u_{i_1} = u_{i_2}$  and
- $c_{i_1} \neq c_{i_2}$ .

In order to intensify the search,  $i_1$  is chosen just before or after a color change. We have used the same moves for the binary paintshop problem.

5.2. **Necklace splitting moves.** The local search designed for the paint shop version can be applied to the necklace version – the search must be stopped as soon as the number of cuts becomes less than or equal to  $(q - 1)t$ . It appears that in the special case of the necklace, we can design another local search.

For the necklace splitting problem, the objective is to find a fair division between  $q$  thieves, with the number of cuts  $N = (q - 1)t$  given by the theorem 1. Remark that this number of cuts is not always the minimum.

The model is made of  $2 * N$  variables, i.e for each cut we have 2 variables, the place (in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ) of the cut and the thief who receives the part just after the cut. For breaking symmetries, we give the first part to the first thief. The initial configuration is made of  $N$  random cuts and each part is randomly assigned to a thief. The objective function to minimize is the sum of the deviations for each type and thief couple between the current division and a fair one. The algorithm stops when a fair division is found, or when a timeout is reached.

The local search algorithm performs 2 types of moves :

- Displacement of a cut : a cut is chosen, and is displaced to a new place which is distant of less than  $D$  places from the current place.
- Change of thief : a part is chosen and given to another thief, distinct from the thieves that own the next left and right parts, in order to keep constant the number of cuts.

We wanted to perform small moves, that can be efficiently incrementally evaluated. We limited therefore each cut displacement by a maximum distance of  $D = 20$  places to the left or to the right of the current place. We experimentally fixed the ratio between the 2 types of moves (displacements and changes of thief) to 4, i.e we try with a probability of 0.8 a displacement move and a probability of 0.2 a change of thief.

We have implemented a simplified variant for 2 thieves, where the only variables are the  $N$  cuts places and a single type of moves, the cut displacements (also limited with a maximum distance equal to 20).

**5.3. Metaheuristic.** For both problems, the metaheuristic used for escaping local minima is ID-Walk [18]. It is a very simple metaheuristic, based on the size of the explored neighborhood. Like all local search algorithms, the algorithm changes a current configuration by performing at each step a local transformation, i.e. a local move as described above. At the end of the walk, it returns the best configuration found during the walk.

The pseudo-code described in Figure 4 shows in details the main step of the algorithm : how the neighbor that will become the next current configuration is selected. IDWalkStep randomly performs an incomplete exploration of the neighborhood of the current configuration. It selects the first improving or equal neighbor found if any, and in case all `MaxNeighbors` visited neighbors degrade the objective function, it selects the less degrading one. The parameter `MaxNeighbors` of the algorithm is the size of the randomly explored neighborhood. This parameter controls the behavior of the algorithm. If the `MaxNeighbors` potentially explored neighbors represent an important part of the neighborhood, the algorithm will perform more *intensification* than if `MaxNeighbors` is small w.r.t. the size of the neighborhood.

In addition, the *diversification* performed by the algorithm also mainly depends on this parameter. If `Maxneighbors` is small, it is not likely to find a configuration better than or equal to the current one among these explored neighbors. The degradation of the objective obtained then by choosing the less degrading explored neighbor will be greater than if a larger number of neighbors would be tested. With a small part of the neighborhood being explored, it is also not likely that the algorithm returns in the following moves to an already visited configuration and the presence of a tabu list device becomes unnecessary.

For each instance to be solved, this `MaxNeighbors` parameter is automatically tuned. We alternate tuning and running phases. During the tuning phases, the algorithm is run on small walks with different parameter values. The parameter value that yields the best result is selected and used during the next running phase.

## 6. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

The algorithms described in the previous sections were implemented in C++. The implementations were tested on a computer with a Intel Core 2 Duo CPU 2.26 GHz processor, with 1.96 GB RAM, using the GNU-C++ compiler (GCC 3.4.5). For the linear programming resolution, we have used CPLEX 12.2. The local search uses the version of IDWalk implemented in the INCOPI [17] C++ local search library.

The following notations are used.

LP linear programming.

LSp local search designed for the paintshop version (Subsection 5.1).

LSn local search designed for the necklace version (Subsection 5.2).

$n$  the length of the word  $w$ ,

$t$  the cardinality of  $\Sigma$  and

$q$  the number of colors

**Algorithm** IDWalkStep ( $x$  : current configuration,  $best$  : best configuration, MaxNeighbors: maximum number of neighbors to be visited)

```

Candidate  $\leftarrow$  1
RejectedCandidates  $\leftarrow$   $\emptyset$ 
Accepted?  $\leftarrow$  false
while (Candidate  $\leq$  MaxNeighbors) and (not Accepted?)
    Select randomly a neighbor  $x'$  of  $x$ 
    if  $\text{cost}(x') \leq \text{cost}(x)$ 
        Accepted?  $\leftarrow$  true
    else
        RejectedCandidates  $\leftarrow$  RejectedCandidates  $\cup$   $\{x'\}$ 
    endif
    Candidate  $\leftarrow$  Candidate +1
endwhile
if Accepted?
     $x \leftarrow x'$ 
else
     $x \leftarrow$  the configuration in RejectedCandidates with the smallest cost
endif
if  $\text{cost}(x) < \text{cost}(best)$ 
     $best \leftarrow x$ 
endif

```

FIGURE 4. One move by local search metaheuristic IDWalk.

All instances were generated at random, since no benchmark is available (as noted in the Introduction, this problem had not been studied from a practical point of view). They can be downloaded from

[http://cermics.enpc.fr/~meuniefr/home.html/PaintShopNecklaces\\_Instances.html](http://cermics.enpc.fr/~meuniefr/home.html/PaintShopNecklaces_Instances.html)

**6.1. General paint shop problem.** The approaches tested for the (general) paint shop problem are linear programming (Subsection 2.1) and the local search (Subsection 5.1). We have generated 15 instances, as follows. The parameters  $n$ ,  $q$ ,  $t$  are fixed. The  $i$ th letter is an element drawn uniformly at random from  $\Sigma$ , independently from the other letters. Each time a letter is drawn, a color is also drawn, therefore at the end we have for each letter a pool of colors to be attributed to its occurrences.

For the local search method, as it is a stochastic incomplete method depending on the initial configuration, we performed 2 sequences of 10 tries per instance, each try being limited to 1 min CPU time for the first sequence, and to 5 min CPU time for the second sequence.

We report the best and the median solutions among these 10 tries.

The linear programming was experimented with a time limit equal to 30 min CPU time.

The results are given in Table 1.

Linear programming is able to solve optimally the general paint shop problem when the number of types and the number of colors are quite small ( $\leq 5$ ). As soon as these parameters grow, the gap between the upper and lower bounds provided by the linear program becomes large. The local search behaves well, even if we were not able to give a reasonable lower bound to estimate the gap

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	LP (1) 30 min		LSp 60 s		LSp 300 s	
				Solution	Lower Bound	best sol	median sol	best sol	median sol
PS_200_1	200	3	4	7* (15 s)	7	7	7	7	7
PS_200_2	200	5	5	14	9	12	13	12	12
PS_200_3	200	5	10	24	17	21	21	21	21
PS_200_4	200	10	5	33	7	20	21	20	20
PS_200_5	200	10	10	43	18	32	33	32	32
PS_500_1	500	3	4	5* (3 min42 s)	5	6	6	6	6
PS_500_2	500	5	5	16	9	17	18	15	17
PS_500_3	500	5	10	27	13	25	27	25	26
PS_500_4	500	10	5	68	7	32	33	29	32
PS_500_5	500	10	10	109	14	44	47	41	44
PS_1000_1	1000	3	4	5* (18 min35 s)	5	8	10	7	8
PS_1000_2	1000	5	5	29	6	20	22	18	20
PS_1000_3	1000	5	10	58	12	37	38	33	35
PS_1000_4	1000	10	5	129	7	40	44	41	43
PS_1000_5	1000	10	10	211	15	65	67	58	62

TABLE 1. Results for the general paint shop problem.

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	LP (1) 30 min		LP (2) 30 min		LP (3) 30 min		LSp 60 s		LSp 300 s	
				Sol.	Lower Bound	Sol.	Lower Bound	Sol.	Lower Bound	Best Sol.	Median Sol.	Best Sol.	Median Sol.
BPS_250	250	2	125	35*	35	35*	28	35*	35	35	35	35	35
BPS_500	500	2	250	70	52	133	18	71	51	70	71	70	71
BPS_1000	1000	2	500	143	71	-	-	144	73	135	135	135	135
BPS_2000	2000	2	1000	365	105	-	-	292	105	270	277	270	272
BPS_5000	5000	2	2500	895	162	-	-	892	160	685	691	686	687

TABLE 2. Results for the binary paint shop problem.

with the optima. The feasible solutions found by the local search are anyway largely better than the ones obtained by the linear program, and in a laps of time really smaller.

**6.2. Binary paint shop problem.** The approaches tested are the three formulations of linear programming, (1), (3) and (2), as well as local search. Actually, (2) has appeared to be systematically and significantly worst than the other linear programs. We have therefore decided to omit its results in the tables.

We have generated instances, where a sequence of  $n$  letters with 2 occurrences of each letter is randomly generated. The objective is to color this sequence with 2 colors, with a minimum of color changes.

The results are given in Table 2.

Note that LP (2) behaves very badly – the ‘-’ means that CPLEX terminates because of an ‘out of memory’ error. The reason is probably that it has too much variables.

The binary paintshop problem also proves the superiority of the local search to find good feasible solutions, and again more quickly than linear programming. We can anyway note that the linear programming approach (LP (1) and (3)) is efficient up to  $n \simeq 250$  and the instances of this size are solved to optimality in less than 30 minutes. The efficiency of the linear programming approach was already noted in Section 3, in which it was tested on instances of size  $n \leq 240$ .

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	LP (1)	LSn		LSp	
				Time	Succ.	Time (in s)	Succ.	Time (in s)
N20_3_5_1	300	3	5	7 s42	10	0.15	10	0.10
N20_3_5_2	300	3	5	14 s93	8	0.09	10	0.09
N20_3_5_3	300	3	5	3 s14	9	0.03	10	0.05
N20_3_5_4	300	3	5	7 s40	10	0.11	10	0.05
N20_3_5_5	300	3	5	15 s07	9	0.02	10	0.03
N20_4_5_1	400	4	5	2 min17 s	10	0.23	10	0.87
N20_4_5_2	400	4	5	4 min52 s	10	0.18	10	0.60
N20_4_5_3	400	4	5	3 min20 s	10	0.10	10	0.46
N20_4_5_4	400	4	5	35 s79	10	0.04	10	0.32
N20_4_5_5	400	4	5	2 min23 s	10	0.06	10	0.36
N20_5_5_1	500	5	5	–	10	0.69	10	2.37
N20_5_5_2	500	5	5	15 min03 s	10	0.18	10	1.05
N20_5_5_3	500	5	5	–	10	0.41	10	1.38
N20_5_5_4	500	5	5	36 min15 s	10	0.63	10	1.16
N20_5_5_5	500	5	5	–	10	0.87	10	1.88

TABLE 3. Results for the necklace splitting problem with  $q \geq 3$  – small instances.

**6.3. Necklace splitting.** When there are strictly more than two thieves, we have tested the two formulations (1) and (3) of the linear programming and the two local search methods LSn and LSp. (2) was not able to solve any instance, whence we have omitted its results in the table. When there are exactly two thieves, we have added the path-following method of Section 4.

The instances were generated uniformly at random among the instances with the parameters  $n$ ,  $q$  and  $t$  fixed, and with the same number of beads of each type. We have generated 15 “small” and 15 “large” instances with  $q \geq 3$  and also 15 “small” and 25 “large” instances with  $q = 2$ .

For the linear programming approaches, we have initialized the branch-and-bound with an upper bound  $(q - 1)t + 0.1$  since by the splitting necklace theorem (Theorem 1), we know that there is a solution strictly better than this value, and we stop the branch-and-bound when the first integer solution is found (in CPLEX, there is a so-called “MIP integer solution limit”).

For the LSn local search method, as described in previous section, we use a model where the number of cuts is fixed to  $(q - 1)t$  cuts. This method stops with success when a fair division is found. The LSp local search method works with fair divisions and tries to lower the number of cuts. It stops with success when a solution with  $(q - 1)t$  or less cuts is found.

The results are given in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6. For the local search methods, we performed 10 tries per instance, each try being limited to 1 min. CPU time. We report for each instance, the number of successes and the average time for a successful try.

When there are 3 or more thieves (see Tables 3 and 4) the local search – especially LSn – is efficient, and the linear programming approach hardly finds a solution for relative small instances ( $n \simeq 400$ ). For large instances (Table 4), linear programming and LSp were both unable to solve any of them in the time limits.

We can remark – see Table 6 – that for the problem with 2 thieves and 3 types of beads, the cubical path-following method is more efficient than the local search, in the sense that it is a complete method that always finds a solution in a time comparable with the time of a successful

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	LSn	
				Success	Time (in s)
N200_3_5_1	3000	3	5	5	2.4
N200_3_5_2	3000	3	5	7	1.6
N200_3_5_3	3000	3	5	8	8.9
N200_3_5_4	3000	3	5	6	3.6
N200_3_5_5	3000	3	5	6	5.5
N200_4_5_1	4000	4	5	5	14.3
N200_4_5_2	4000	4	5	8	11.9
N200_4_5_3	4000	4	5	4	6.9
N200_4_5_4	4000	4	5	5	12.7
N200_4_5_5	4000	4	5	3	33.5
N200_5_5_1	5000	5	5	2	34.3
N200_5_5_2	5000	5	5	1	35.2
N200_5_5_3	5000	5	5	3	15.2
N200_5_5_4	5000	5	5	1	11.5
N200_5_5_5	5000	5	5	3	34.9

TABLE 4. Results for the necklace splitting problem with  $q \geq 3$  – large instances.

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	Cubical path-following Time	LP (1)	LP (3)	LSn		LSp	
					Time	Time	Succ.	Time (s)	Succ.	Time (s)
N1000_2_3_1	6000	2	3	0.28 s	13 min54 s	10 min10 s	9	0.18	0	–
N1000_2_3_2	6000	2	3	0.22 s	13 min50 s	12 min18 s	10	1.23	7	25.48
N1000_2_3_3	6000	2	3	0.63 s	5 min09 s	13 min19 s	10	0.87	2	19.74
N1000_2_3_4	6000	2	3	1.39 s	5 min46 s	21 min40 s	9	1.18	0	–
N1000_2_3_5	6000	2	3	1.31 s	2 min47 s	10 min53 s	10	5.30	0	–
N100_2_10_1	2000	2	10	4 min31 s	3 min03 s	2 min02 s	10	0.11	0	–
N100_2_10_2	2000	2	10	25 s	2 min33 s	2 min13 s	10	0.10	1	15.80
N100_2_10_3	2000	2	10	14 s	2 min00 s	2 min15 s	10	0.14	0	–
N100_2_10_4	2000	2	10	1 min11 s	1 min08 s	1 min27 s	10	0.17	1	3.03
N100_2_10_5	2000	2	10	1 min45 s	2 min00 s	2 min35 s	10	0.08	0	–
N20_2_20_1	800	2	20	3 min22 s	12 s	1 s	10	0.10	10	0.15
N20_2_20_2	800	2	20	3 min07 s	25 s	6 s	10	0.12	10	0.09
N20_2_20_3	800	2	20	1 min45 s	6 s	9 s	10	0.11	10	0.36
N20_2_20_4	800	2	20	1 min59 s	1 s	6 s	10	0.05	10	0.78
N20_2_20_5	800	2	20	7 min57 s	6 s	4 s	10	0.25	10	0.11

TABLE 5. Results for the necklace splitting problem with  $q = 2$  – small instances.

execution of the local search method. This latter method sometimes fails, depending on the initial configuration. On the contrary, when the number of types grows, the cubical path-following method becomes less efficient than the local search method.

We can also note – see Table 5 – that the linear programming approach and LSp work better when the number of cuts  $(q - 1)t$  ensured by the necklace theorem becomes high. This can be explained by the strategy followed by these approaches, which consists in decreasing the number of cuts until reaching the target number.

Instance	$n$	$q$	$t$	Cubical	LSn	
				path-following Time (in s)	Success	Time (in s)
N5000_2.3.1	30000	2	3	1.1	7	6.2
N5000_2.3.2	30000	2	3	4.8	7	1.9
N5000_2.3.3	30000	2	3	1.2	9	2.8
N5000_2.3.4	30000	2	3	2.7	7	2.5
N5000_2.3.5	30000	2	3	2.7	9	5.8
N10000_2.3.1	60000	2	3	5.4	5	7.0
N10000_2.3.2	60000	2	3	5.4	2	9.3
N10000_2.3.3	60000	2	3	4.9	1	27.1
N10000_2.3.4	60000	2	3	2.8	4	2.5
N10000_2.3.5	60000	2	3	3.4	8	1.4
N15000_2.3.1	90000	2	3	12.6	4	3.7
N15000_2.3.2	90000	2	3	3.0	0	–
N15000_2.3.3	90000	2	3	4.4	8	5.8
N15000_2.3.4	90000	2	3	4.3	2	3.4
N15000_2.3.5	90000	2	3	4.3	3	12.3
N1000_2.5.1	10000	2	5	7.36	10	1.9
N1000_2.5.2	10000	2	5	39.0	9	0.2
N1000_2.5.3	10000	2	5	9.72	10	9.4
N1000_2.5.4	10000	2	5	36.7	10	0.8
N1000_2.5.5	10000	2	5	620	10	1.5
N2000_2.5.1	20000	2	5	92.3	8	2.1
N2000_2.5.2	20000	2	5	259	8	6.8
N2000_2.5.3	20000	2	5	47	9	1.1
N2000_2.5.4	20000	2	5	143	6	1.5
N2000_2.5.5	20000	2	5	231	9	1.5

TABLE 6. Results for the necklace splitting problem with  $q = 2$  – large instances.

6.4. **Conclusion.** The two local searches – when applied to the problems they have been designed for – are really efficient. Exact approaches exist when the size of the word (the total number of beads on the necklace) is small (linear programming) for both the necklace problem and the paintshop problem, and for the necklace problem with two thieves and not too many types, say  $\leq 5$  (the path-following method). It is worth noting that the path-following method is very efficient for the splitting of the necklace between two thieves, when there are only 3 types of beads, the solution being computed in few seconds even for 90'000 beads.

## 7. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

On the theoretical hand, many questions remain open both for the paintshop and the necklace versions – see Section 1. These questions come within complexity theory, discrete probability, combinatorial optimization and combinatorial topology. So many areas meet rarely in the same problem. On the practical hand, we know how to solve the paintshop-necklace problem for high instances with local searches, and we propose approaches through linear programming and a path-following method. An efficient exact method for the paintshop problem remains to be designed, as well for the necklace problem for three thieves and more.

Finally, let us emphasize that the path following method appears to be quite efficient. Actually, it was designed to solve the problem of finding a full  $t$ -cube (see Section 4), which is more general than the splitting of the necklace. The existence of a full  $t$ -cube is very close of Tucker’s lemma, the combinatorial counterpart of the Borsuk-Ulam theorem. One may ask whether this method would be efficient for the computation of the zeroes of antipodal map  $f : \mathcal{S}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , whose existence is ensured by the Borsuk-Ulam theorem. However, a step is missing, namely the existence of a “cubical approximation theorem” which is a still open question: any continuous mapping can be approximated by a simplicial map; it is not known if a similar statement holds for a cubical map. Since cubical complexes are often more tractable than simplicial complexes a positive answer to this latter question would provide a promising approach to the computation of zeroes of antipodal maps.

#### REFERENCES

1. N. Alon, *Splitting necklaces*, Adv. in Math. **63** (1987), 247–253.
2. ———, *Non-constructive proofs in combinatorics*, Proc. of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Kyoto 1990, Japan, Springer Verlag, Tokyo, 1991, pp. 1421–1429.
3. N. Alon, D. Moshkovitz, and S. Safra, *Algorithmic construction of sets for  $k$ -restrictions*, ACM Trans. Algorithms **2** (2006), 153–177.
4. N. Alon and D. West, *The Borsuk-Ulam theorem and bisection of necklaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **98** (1986), 623–628.
5. H. Amini, F. Meunier, H. Michel, and A. Mohajeri, *Greedy colouring of the binary paintshop problem*, Journal of Discrete Algorithms **8** (2010), 8–14.
6. S. D. Andres and W. Hochstättler, *Some heuristics for the binary paintshop problem and their expected number of colour changes*, Journal of Discrete Algorithms (2010).
7. S. N. Bhatt and C. E. Leiserson, *How to assemble tree machines*, Proc. of the 14th Symposium on the Theory of Computing, San Francisco, 1981, USA, 1981, pp. 99–104.
8. P. S. Bonsma, T. Epping, and W. Hochstättler, *Complexity results on restricted instances of a paint shop problem for words*, Discrete Appl. Math. **154** (2006), 1335–1343.
9. M. de Longueville and R. Zivaljevic, *The Borsuk-Ulam-property, Tucker-property and constructive proofs in combinatorics*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. A **113** (2006), 839–850.
10. T. Epping, W. Hochstättler, and P. Oertel, *Complexity results on a paint shop problem*, Discrete Appl. Math. **136** (2004), 217–226.
11. C. H. Goldberg and D. West, *Bisection of circle colorings*, SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods **6** (1985), 93–106.
12. J. Matoušek, *Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem*, Springer Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 2003.
13. N. Meggido and C. H. Papadimitriou, *A note on total functions, existence theorems, and computational complexity*, Tech. report, IBM, 1989.
14. F. Meunier, *Discrete splittings of the necklace*, Mathematics of Operations Research **33** (2008), 678–688.
15. F. Meunier and A. Sebő, *Paint shop, odd cycles and splitting necklace*, Discrete Appl. Math. **157** (2009), 780–793.
16. R. H. Möhring, D. Wagner, and F. Wagner, *VLSI Network Design*, vol. 8, ch. 8, pp. 625–712, 1995.
17. B. Neveu and G. Trombettoni, *Incop : An Open Library for INcomplete Combinatorial OPTimization*, Proc. International Conference on Principles Constraint Programming, CP’03 (Kinsale,Ireland), LNCS, vol. 2833, Springer, 2003, pp. 909–913.
18. B. Neveu, G. Trombettoni, and F. Glover, *ID-Walk : A Candidate List Strategy with a Simple Diversification Device*, Proc. 10th International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming - CP 2004, vol. LNCS 3258, Springer, 2004, pp. 423–437.
19. C. Papadimitriou, *On the complexity of the parity argument and other inefficient proofs of existence*, J. Comput System Sci. **48** (1994), 498–532.
20. H. Scarf, *The approximation of fixed points of a continuous mapping*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **15** (1967), 1328–1343.

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS EST, CERMICS, ENPC, 6-8 AVENUE BLAISE PASCAL, CITÉ DESCARTES CHAMPS-SUR-MARNE, 77455 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE CEDEX 2, FRANCE.

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS EST, LIGM, ENPC, 6-8 AVENUE BLAISE PASCAL, CITÉ DESCARTES CHAMPS-SUR-MARNE, 77455 MARNE-LA-VALLÉE CEDEX 2, FRANCE.

*E-mail address:* frederic.meunier@enpc.fr, bertrand.neveu@enpc.fr